# Pendergrass Fairwold School

3435 Token Street Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Grades K-12 High School

**Enrollment** 51 Students

**Principal** Patricia W. Brown 803-735-3435

Superintendent Dr. Allen J. Coles 803-231-7500

**Board Chair** Lane Quinn 803-231-7556

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

# ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD

## ABSOLUTE RATING

N/AV

Absolute Ratings of High Schools with Students like Ours Excellent Good Average Below Average Unsatisfactory

0 1 0 5 1

#### IMPROVEMENT RATING

N/AV

### ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

О

This school met 0 out of 5 objectives. The objectives included performance and participation of students in various groups.

Definition: As required by the United States Department of Education, Adequate Yearly Progress specifies that the statewide target is met for All Students and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL

By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country.

> http://ed.sc.gov http://www.sceoc.org

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD							
Year	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress				
2003	N/A	N/A	N/A				
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A				
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A				
2006	N/AV	N/AV	No				

### DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance

HIGH SCHOOL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (HSAP) EXAM PASSAGE RATE: SECOND YEAR STUDENTS								
		Our School		High Schools with				
				Students Like Ours				
Percent	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006		
Passed 2 subtests	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.8		
Passed 1 subtest	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.0		
Passed no subtests	N/A	100.0	100.0	N/A	N/A	47.5		

HSAP PASSAGE RATE BY SPRING 2006		
	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Percent	N/A	87.8%

ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIP		
Percent of	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	0.0	2.6
Seniors who met the SAT/ACT requirement	0.0	3.0
Seniors who met the grade point average	0.0	20.9

<sup>\*</sup>Using only the SAT/ACT and grade point average requirements

GRADUATION RATE		
	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Number of Students	N/A	111
Number of Diplomas	N/A	61
Rate	N/A	60.7%

END OF COURSE TESTS		
Percent of students scoring 70 or above on:	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2	N/A	72.6
English 1	N/A	52.0
Biology 1/Applied Biology 2	N/A	37.5
Physical Science	N/A	22.7
All Subjects	N/A	46.4

PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS									
	HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2006		Eligibility Schola		Graduation Rate				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Met State Objective		
All Students	N/A	N/A	2	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Gender									
Male	N/A	N/A	2	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Female	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Racial/Ethnic Group									
White	N/A	N/A	1	0.0	N/A	N/A			
African American	N/A	N/A	1	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Racial/Ethnic Group									
Non disabled	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Disabilities other than speech	N/A	N/A	2	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Migrant Status									
Migrant	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Non-migrant	N/A	N/A	2	0.0	N/A	N/A			
English Proficiency									
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Non-Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	2	0.0	N/A	N/A			
Socio-Economic Status									
Subsidized meals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Full-pay meals	N/A	N/A	2	0.0	N/A	N/A			

n = number of students on which percentage is calculated

		F BY GE	

HSAP PERFORMANCE BY GRO	UP								
	Enrollment 1st	% Tested	% Below Basis	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient and Advanced (	Performance Objective	Participation Objective Met
En	, glish/Lang	uage Art			nce Objec	tive = 52.			
All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Gender									
Male	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Female	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Racial/Ethnic Group									
White	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Disability Status									
Not Disabled	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Disabled	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Migrant Status									
Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Non-Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
English Proficiency									
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Non-Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Socio-Economic Status									
Subsidized meals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Full-pay meals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 50.0%								
All Students	N/A							
Gender								
Male	N/A							
Female	N/A							
Racial/Ethnic Group								
White	N/A							
African American	N/A							
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A							
Hispanic	N/A							
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A							
Disability Status								
Not Disabled	N/A							
Disabled	N/A							
Migrant Status								
Migrant	N/A							
Non-Migrant	N/A							
English Proficiency								
Limited English Proficient	N/A							
Non-Limited English Proficient	N/A							
Socio-Economic Status								
Subsidized meals	N/A							
Full-pay meals	N/A							

Student attendance in this school \*or greater than last year

SCHOOL PROFILE

	Our School	Cha La	ange from ast Year	Hig Scho with St Like	ools udents	Median High School
Students (n= 51)				Liito	Juio	
Retention rate	50.0%		om 52.8%		12.4%	7.0%
Attendance rate		Up from			93.2%	95.5%
Eligible for gifted and talented With disabilities other than speech	0.0% 56.4%		nge om 81.5%		2.9% 16.8%	7.9% 12.3%
Older than usual for grade	37.8%		om 47.9%		19.7%	9.5%
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses	0.0%	No chai	nge		0.4%	1.2%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	0.0%		nge		0.0%	11.2%
Successful on AP/IB exams		N/A			N/A	N/A
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship*	0.0%	,	0.40/		0.0%	10.2%
Annual dropout rate			om 3.1%		2.3%	2.8%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	N/A				4.2%	3.5%
Enrollment in career/technology center courses		N/A			223	448
Students participating in worked-based experiences	N/A	N/A			22.1%	24.2%
Career/technology students mastering core competencies	N/A	N/A			69.0%	80.0%
Career/technology completers placed * Using only SAT/ACT and Grade Point Average requirem Teachers (n= 13)	N/A ents.	N/A		l	98.9%	99.1%
Teachers with advanced degrees	69.2%	Down fr	om 73.3%		56.1%	55.5%
Continuing contract teachers	N/AV				N/AV	N/AV
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	N/A	N/A			22.7%	9.6%
Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates	0.0%	No chai	nge		11.6%	9.9%
Teachers returning from previous year			om 91.9%		78.9%	86.3%
Teacher attendance rate			om 95.0%		94.3%	95.3%
Average teacher salary Prof. development days/teacher	\$50,871 7.1 davs		% n 5.6 days		41,837 2 days	\$42,943 11.2 days
School	,		,		,	
Principal's years at school	5.0	Up from	1 4.0		2.0	3.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects			om 5.2 to 1	19	0.0 to 1	25.7 to 1
Prime instructional time	85.6%	Up from	83.6%		87.1%	89.3%
Dollars spent per pupil*	\$41,020	Down 1	3.6%	:	\$8,255	\$6,792
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries*	55.1%	Down fr	om 56.5%		54.7%	55.3%
Percent of expenditures for instruction*	57.1%				61.0%	61.1%
Opportunities in the arts	Good	No chai	nge		Good	Excellent
Parents attending conferences		99.0% Up from 79.9%			88.1%	92.8%
SACS accreditation	Yes No change				Yes	Yes
Character development  * Prior year audited financial data are reported.	Excellent	No chai	•		Good	Good
				District		State
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by high				7.1% 1.5%		6.2% 10.2%
. 01 7 0 7 0 7 1					tate Objective	
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in	this school		0.0%			
Student attendance in this school			94.0%*			Yes

94.0%\*

Yes

#### REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

Pendergrass Fairwold School serves medically fragile, severely mentally and physically handicapped students from ages 3-21. All students receive services recommended by their Individual Education Plan (IEP) and are monitored for progress according to the guidelines of the IEP. Our school also houses a vocational program for special education self contained students below the age of 21 who qualify for additional Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ( IDEA) services and whose parents request such services.

Our test scores have been statistically insignificant because our school is small and affords us small percentages of students who are eligible for alternative testing. However, statistically insignificant scores have not affected our determination to make sure that our students achieve their maximum potential. We have implemented a two-fold approach to student achievement at Fairwold School. We have concentrated on staff development and parental involvement. Our staff development has provided our staff with additional tools to help them increase communication and social interaction skills in our predominately non-verbal student body. We have concentrated on helping staff improve their use of technology to encourage students to find a voice to express their needs and feelings. Our parental involvement has been a push to get family members involved with the school and involved in helping the disabled family member complete homework tasks sent from the school.

These practices have helped us get parents and families involved with their disabled family member so that the student becomes a contributor in the family and the family sees more opportunities to interact with the student in the home. The consistency of stimulation, at home and at school, has made our students more attentive and more willing to try new activities and tasks.

We are still struggling to fully implement our school renewal plan. Our parental involvement program has yielded some successes but we still need to reach many more of our students' families. We must continue to improve school climate and make our staff development more effective in giving teachers the tools they need to accelerate achievement in our students.

Victoria Osborne, SIC Chairperson Patricia W. Brown, Principal

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS			
	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	11	0	3
Percent satisfied with learning environment	81.8%	N/R	I/S
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	81.8%	N/R	I/S
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	63.6%	N/R	I/S

<sup>\*</sup>Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools without grade 11, only the highest grade was included.